arXiv:1401.0921v1 [cs.DS] 5 Jan 2014

Maintaining partial sums in logarithmic time

Jochen Burghardt

Berlin

Abstract

We present a data structure that allows to maintain in logarithmic time all partial sums of elements of a linear array during incremental changes of element's values.

Key words: Partial sums; Data structures; Algorithms

1 Motivation

Assume you have a linear array $x_0, \ldots, x_{N-1}$ of numbers which are frequently updated, and you need to maintain all partial sums $\sum_{i=j}^{k} x_i$, where $0 \leqslant j \leqslant k < N$. We present a data structure that allows to access each x_k and to compute any partial sum in time $\mathcal{O}(\log(N))$.

As an application, think of the x_k as integer numbers indicating the probabilities of certain events; by chosing a uniformly distributed random number r in the range $0 \leqslant r < \sum_{i=0}^{N-1} x_i$ and selecting the unique $k \in \{0, \ldots, N\}$ with $\sum_{i=k}^{N-1} x_i \leqslant r < \sum_{i=k-1}^{N-1} x_i$, event k is selected with probability $\frac{x_k}{\sum_{i=0}^{N-1} x_i}$.

If the probability distribution of events changes frequently, the partial sums need to be recomputed every time, which takes time $\mathcal{O}(N)$ using the naive algorithm.

2 Data structure and access algorithms

Our solution is to store a mix of individual values x_i and partial sums in the array, thus realizing a binary tree where each node represents the sum of all leafs below it. Figure 1 sketches an example for $N = 16$, the partial sums corresponding to the nodes indicated by solid circles are stored as s_i.



Fig. 1. Data structure

In some respect, this idea is similar to that of heap sort [AHU74, Sect. 3.4], which also uses a mix of representations (sorted along a path and unsorted within a level) to combine the advantages of both. Our data structure combines the advantages of storing single values (easily updatable) and sums (no need to recompute them).

Formally, let N be a power of 2; let an array $x_0, \ldots, x_{N-1}$ of size N be given. Instead of this original array, we maintain the array $s_0, \ldots, s_{N-1}$, where

$$s_k := \sum_{i=0}^{\gcd(N,k)-1} x_{k+i} \tag{1}$$

Here, $\gcd(N,k)$ is the greatest common divisor of N and k, i.e., the largest power of 2 dividing k. It corresponds to the least 1 bit in the 2–complement representation of k, which can be computed as bitwise `and` of $N+k$ and $N-k$.

The following algorithms, given in C code in Fig. 2, maintain our data structure.

- `int sumN(int k)` returns $\sum_{i=\mathtt{k}}^{N-1} x_i$;
- `int sum(int j,k)` returns $\sum_{i=\mathtt{j}}^{\mathtt{k}} x_i$;
- `int get(int k)` retrieves $x_{\mathtt{k}}$;
- `void inc(int k,x)` adds `x` to $x_{\mathtt{k}}$;
- `void set(int k,x)` assigns `x` to $x_{\mathtt{k}}$; and
- `int find(int x)` returns some k such that $\sum_{i=k+1}^{N-1} x_i \leqslant \mathtt{x} < \sum_{i=k}^{N-1} x_i$, provided $0 \leqslant \mathtt{x} < \sum_{i=0}^{N-1} x_i$; k is unique if no x_i is negative.

Figure 3 shows some sample runs on the data in Fig. 1.

In order to deal with arrays whose size is not a power of 2, assume $s_k = 0$ for all $k \geqslant M$, where $N/2 < M \leqslant N$. At two places it is neccessary to test the index boundary explicitely, using the function `int S(int i)`.

The algorithms can immediately be generalized to deal with arbitrary (non–

```
int s[M];

#define S(i)              (i<M ? s[i] : 0)

#define gcdN(k)           ((N+k) & (N-k))

int sumN(int k) {
    int i, sm = 0;
    for (i=k; i<M; i+=gcdN(i))
        sm += s[i];
    return sm;
}

#define sum(j,k)          (sumN(j) - sumN(k+1))

int get(int k) {
    int i, x = s[k];
    for (i=1; i<gcdN(k) && k+i<M; i*=2)
        x -= s[k+i];
    return x;
}

void inc(int k,x) {
    int i;
    for (i=k; i>=0; i-=gcdN(i))
        s[i] += x;
}

#define set(k,x)          inc(k,x-get(k))

int find(int x) {
    int i, k = 0, pv = s[N/2];
    for (i=N/2; i>0; i/=2)
        if (x < pv) {
            pv += S(k+i*3/2) - s[k+i];
            k  += i;
        } else {
            pv += S(k+i/2);
        }
    return k;
}
```

Fig. 2. Algorithms

`sumN(3)`

i		3	4	8	16
sm	0	3	20	71	

`get(12)`

i		1	2	4
x	17	15	6	

`inc(12,...)`

i	12	8	0

`inc(3,...)`

i	3	2	0

`find(69)`

i		8	4	2	1	0
pv	51	68	77	71	71	
k	0			2	3	

Fig. 3. Sample runs

abelian) group elements instead of integers; if `find` is to be used, ordered groups are neccessary.

3 Complexity

All algorithms take $\mathcal{O}(\log N)$ time due to the implicit tree structure. For `sumN` and `inc`, note that the value of $\gcd(N, \mathtt{i})$ grows in every loop cycle, since

$$\gcd(N, i \pm \gcd(N, i)) \geqslant 2 \cdot \gcd(N, i) \; . \tag{2}$$

In the following sections 4 to 7, we give correctness proofs of the main algorithms in the Hoare calculus [Hoa69].

4 Correctness of `get`

To see the correctness of `get`, show

$$\sum_{i=1}^{2^a-1} f(i) = \sum_{i=0}^{a-1} \sum_{j=0}^{2^i-1} f(2^i + j) \tag{3}$$

by induction on a; note that commutativity of $+$ is not required for the proof.

If $\gcd(N, k) = 2^a$, we have $\gcd(N, k + 2^i) = 2^i$ for $0 \leqslant i < a$, and therefor

$$s_k \overset{(1)}{=} x_k + \sum_{i=1}^{2^a-1} x_{k+i} \overset{(3)}{=} x_k + \sum_{i=0}^{a-1} \sum_{j=0}^{2^i-1} x_{k+2^i+j} \overset{(1)}{=} x_k + \sum_{i=0}^{a-1} s_{k+2^i} \; . \tag{4}$$

We define the abbreviation $\Sigma_{\mathtt{k},b} := s_{\mathtt{k}+b} + s_{\mathtt{k}+2\cdot b} + s_{\mathtt{k}+4\cdot b} + \ldots + s_{\mathtt{k}+\gcd(N,\mathtt{k})/2}$.

By equation (4), we obtain $s_{\mathtt{k}} = x_{\mathtt{k}} + \Sigma_{\mathtt{k},1}$, justifying the step in lines 4.–5.

We have $\Sigma_{\mathtt{k},b} = 0$ if $b \geqslant \gcd(N,\mathtt{k})$ or $\mathtt{k}+b \geqslant M$; this justifies lines 13.–14.

We can now apply the Hoare calculus to the code of `int get(int k)`:

```
1. int get(int k) {
2.     int i, x;
3.     x = s[k];
4.     i = 1;
5.     x = x_k + Σ_{k,i} ∧ i ⩽ gcd(N,k)
6.     while (i < gcdN(k) && k+i < M) {
7.         x = x_k + Σ_{k,i} ∧ i < gcd(N,k)
8.         x = x - s[k+i];
9.         x = x_k + Σ_{k,2·i} ∧ i < gcd(N,k)
10.        i = i * 2;
11.        x = x_k + Σ_{k,i} ∧ i ⩽ gcd(N,k)
12.    }
13.    x = x_k + Σ_{k,i} ∧ (i = gcd(N,k) ∨ k+i ⩾ M)
14.    return x;
15. }
```

5 Correctness of `inc`

Next, we show that `inc` makes sufficiently many updates. By (1), s_i depends on x_k, iff $i \leqslant k < i + \gcd(N,i)$.

Hence, if s_i depends on x_k, then so does $s_{i-\gcd(N,i)}$, since

$$\begin{aligned} i - \gcd(N,i) &\leqslant \quad i \quad \leqslant k \text{ and, by (2),} \\ (i - \gcd(N,i)) + \gcd(N, i - \gcd(N,i)) &\geqslant i + \gcd(N,i) > k\ . \end{aligned}$$

But no $s_{i'}$ for $i - \gcd(N,i) < i' < i$ depends on x_k:

Let $i = 2^a \cdot b$ and $i' = 2^{a'} \cdot b'$ for odd numbers b, b'.
Then $a' < a$ since $i - \gcd(N,i) = 2^a \cdot (b-1)$.
And $2^{a'} \cdot b' = i' < i = 2^{a-a'} \cdot 2^{a'} \cdot b$ implies $b' + 1 \leqslant 2^{a-a'} \cdot b$.
Hence, $i' + \gcd(N,i') = 2^{a'} \cdot (b'+1) \leqslant 2^{a'} \cdot 2^{a-a'} \cdot b = i \leqslant k$.

6 Correctness of `sumN`

The loop in `sumN` satisfies the invariant $\texttt{sm} = \sum_{j=\texttt{k}}^{\texttt{i}-1} x_j$, since

$$\texttt{sm} + s_i \overset{(1)}{=} \left(\sum_{j=\texttt{k}}^{\texttt{i}-1} x_j\right) + \left(\sum_{j=0}^{\gcd(N,\texttt{i})-1} x_{\texttt{i}+j}\right) = \sum_{j=\texttt{k}}^{\texttt{i}+\gcd(N,\texttt{i})-1} x_j \ .$$

This justifies the step in lines 7.–9. For lines 13.–14. note that $x_j = 0$ for $j \geqslant M$.

```
1.  int sumN(int k) {
2.      int i, sm;
3.      sm = 0;
4.      i  = k;
5.      sm = ∑_{j=k}^{i-1} x_j
6.      while (i < M) {
7.          sm = ∑_{j=k}^{i-1} x_j
8.          sm = sm + s[i];
9.          sm = ∑_{j=k}^{i+gcd(N,i)-1} x_j
10.         i  = i  + gcdN(i);
11.         sm = ∑_{j=k}^{i-1} x_j
12.     }
13.     sm = ∑_{j=k}^{i-1} x_j ∧ i ⩾ M
14.     return sm;
15. }
```

7 Correctness of `find`

The loop in `find` satisfies the invariant

$$\begin{aligned} &\textstyle\sum_{j=\texttt{k}+2\cdot\texttt{i}}^{N-1} x_j \leqslant \texttt{x} < \sum_{j=\texttt{k}}^{N-1} x_j \quad \text{and} \quad \left(\texttt{i} \geqslant 2 \Rightarrow \texttt{pv} = \textstyle\sum_{j=\texttt{k}+\texttt{i}}^{N-1} x_j\right) \\ &\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\quad \text{and} \quad \gcd(N,k) \geqslant \gcd(N,i) = i \ . \end{aligned} \tag{5}$$

To show this, note that for $i \geqslant 2$, we have

$$s_{\texttt{k}+\texttt{i}} \overset{(1)}{=} \sum_{j=0}^{\gcd(N,\texttt{k}+\texttt{i})-1} x_{\texttt{k}+\texttt{i}+j} \overset{(5)}{=} \sum_{j=0}^{\texttt{i}-1} x_{\texttt{k}+\texttt{i}+j} = \sum_{j=\texttt{k}+\texttt{i}}^{\texttt{k}+2\cdot\texttt{i}-1} x_j \ ,$$

and similarly

$$s_{\mathtt{k+i/2}} = \sum_{j=\mathtt{k+i/2}}^{\mathtt{k+i-1}} x_j \quad \text{and} \quad s_{\mathtt{k+i\cdot 3/2}} = \sum_{j=\mathtt{k+i\cdot 3/2}}^{\mathtt{k+2\cdot i-1}} x_j \ ,$$

hence, we get

$$\mathtt{pv} + s_{\mathtt{k+i\cdot 3/2}} - s_{\mathtt{k+i}} = \sum_{j=\mathtt{k+i\cdot 3/2}}^{N-1} x_j \quad \text{and} \quad \mathtt{pv} + s_{\mathtt{k+i/2}} = \sum_{j=\mathtt{k+i/2}}^{N-1} x_j \ , \qquad (6)$$

in case of $\mathtt{x} < \mathtt{pv}$ and $\mathtt{x} \geqslant \mathtt{pv}$, respectively.

We transform the program to make the Hoare verification rules applicable and unfold the last loop cycle ($\mathtt{i} = 1$) to avoid confusing case distinctions. We omit the computation of the pivot element pv in the last cycle, since its value isn't used any more.

We define the abbreviations $\Sigma_a := \sum_{j=a}^{N-1} x_j$ and $p(a,b) :\Leftrightarrow \gcd(N,a) \geqslant \gcd(N,b) = b$

Observe that $\mathtt{i} \geqslant 2 \wedge p(\mathtt{k},\mathtt{i})$ implies both $p(\mathtt{k}+\mathtt{i},\mathtt{i})$ and $p(\mathtt{k},\mathtt{i}/2)$; this is used in lines 13.–15. and 21.–23., respectively.

Equations (6) justify the steps in lines 13.–15. and 19.–21.; equation (1) justifies step 7.–9.

1. $0 \leqslant \mathtt{x} < \Sigma_0$
2. `int find(int x) {`
3. `  int i, k, pv;`
4. $\Sigma_N \leqslant \mathtt{x} < \Sigma_0$
5. `  k  = 0;`
6. `  i  = N/2;`
7. $\Sigma_{\mathtt{k+2\cdot i}} \leqslant \mathtt{x} < \Sigma_{\mathtt{k}} \wedge p(\mathtt{k},\mathtt{i}) \wedge \mathtt{i} \geqslant 1$
8. `  pv = s[N/2];`
9. $\Sigma_{\mathtt{k+2\cdot i}} \leqslant \mathtt{x} < \Sigma_{\mathtt{k}} \wedge \mathtt{pv} = \Sigma_{\mathtt{k+i}} \wedge p(\mathtt{k},\mathtt{i}) \wedge \mathtt{i} \geqslant 1$
10. `  while (i >= 2) {`
11. $\Sigma_{\mathtt{k+2\cdot i}} \leqslant \mathtt{x} < \Sigma_{\mathtt{k}} \wedge \mathtt{pv} = \Sigma_{\mathtt{k+i}} \wedge p(\mathtt{k},\mathtt{i}) \wedge \mathtt{i} \geqslant 2$
12. `  if (x < pv) {`
13. $\Sigma_{\mathtt{k+2\cdot i}} \leqslant \mathtt{x} < \Sigma_{\mathtt{k+i}} \wedge \mathtt{pv} = \Sigma_{\mathtt{k+i}} \wedge p(\mathtt{k},\mathtt{i}) \wedge \mathtt{i} \geqslant 2$
14. `  pv = pv + S(k+i*3/2) - s[k+i];`
15. $\Sigma_{\mathtt{k+2\cdot i}} \leqslant \mathtt{x} < \Sigma_{\mathtt{k+i}} \wedge \mathtt{pv} = \Sigma_{\mathtt{k+3\cdot i/2}} \wedge p(\mathtt{k}+\mathtt{i},\mathtt{i}) \wedge \mathtt{i} \geqslant 2$
16. `  k  = k + i;`
17. $\Sigma_{\mathtt{k+i}} \leqslant \mathtt{x} < \Sigma_{\mathtt{k}} \wedge \mathtt{pv} = \Sigma_{\mathtt{k+i/2}} \wedge p(\mathtt{k},\mathtt{i}) \wedge \mathtt{i} \geqslant 2$
18. `  } else {`

```
19.                 Σ_{k+i} ⩽ x < Σ_k ∧ pv = Σ_{k+i} ∧ p(k, i) ∧ i ⩾ 2
20.                 pv = pv + S(k+i/2);
21.                 Σ_{k+i} ⩽ x < Σ_k ∧ pv = Σ_{k+i/2} ∧ p(k, i) ∧ i ⩾ 2
22.             }
23.             Σ_{k+i} ⩽ x < Σ_k ∧ pv = Σ_{k+i/2} ∧ p(k, i/2) ∧ i ⩾ 2
24.             i = i/2;
25.             Σ_{k+2·i} ⩽ x < Σ_k ∧ pv = Σ_{k+i} ∧ p(k, i) ∧ i ⩾ 1
26.         }
27.         Σ_{k+2} ⩽ x < Σ_k ∧ pv = Σ_{k+1} ∧ i = 1
28.         if (x < pv) {
29.             Σ_{k+2} ⩽ x < Σ_{k+1} ∧ pv = Σ_{k+1}
30.             k  = k + 1;
31.             Σ_{k+1} ⩽ x < Σ_k
32.         } else {
33.             Σ_{k+1} ⩽ x < Σ_k
34.         }
35.         Σ_{k+1} ⩽ x < Σ_k
36.         return k;
37. }
```

This completes the verification proofs of the algorithms given in Fig. 2.
A short version of this paper (without proofs) was published in [Bur01].

References

[AHU74] Alfred V. Aho, John E. Hopcroft, and Jeffrey D. Ullman. *The Design and Analysis of Computer Algorithms*. Addison-Wesley, 1974.

[Bur01] Jochen Burghardt. Maintaining partial sums in logarithmic time. *Nordic Journal of Computing*, 8(4):473–474, 2001.

[Hoa69] C.A.R. Hoare. An axiomatic basis for computer programming. *C.ACM*, 12(10):576–583, Oct 1969.